

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 10-13 and 17-28 were examined and rejected over Sierro et al., Mabille, and several secondary references. Claims 4-9 and 14-16 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 1 is being amended to include the feature of claim 22, which is being canceled.

Thus, claim 1 now recites as follows:

A nozzle piece for a dental powder jet apparatus adapted for an exchangeable assembly on a hand piece and having a discharge nozzle for discharging a mixture of air and a dental powder suitable for cleaning teeth in the area of a gum pocket, as well as a discharge nozzle for a fluid, wherein a front partial length at the outlet cross section of the discharge nozzle projects over a grip of the nozzle piece connected to the hand piece, and wherein the front partial length is formed as a tube and is provided with nozzle openings in the lateral area of the front end of the tube, wherein the mouth of the discharge nozzle for the fluid is axially displaced backwards with respect to the discharge nozzle for the air-powder-mixture,

characterized in that the nozzle opening for the air-powder-mixture and the discharge nozzle for the fluid have such dimensions and are disposed such that an eddy or vortex formation is promoted inside the treated sub- gingival gum pocket,
and in that the fluid discharge nozzle is disposed on one side of the discharge nozzle for the air-powder-mixture.

Claim 1 was rejected over Sierro et al. and Mabille. Claim 22 was rejected over Sierro et al., Mabille and Wiek et al.

None of these references, however, considered either individually or in combination, contains any disclosure or suggestion of the features now claimed in claim 1, namely that the nozzle opening for the air-powder-mixture and the discharge nozzle for the fluid have such dimensions and are disposed such that an eddy or vortex formation is promoted inside the treated sub- gingival gum pocket, in combination with the fluid nozzle being disposed to one side of the air-powder nozzle as now claimed.

The Office Action refers broadly to an eddy or vortex being formed in the Mabille reference (col. 4, lines 53-57), but this is in the context of a liquid orifice 27 being concentric with the air-powder orifice 21 (Fig. 1). The teachings of vortex formation in Mabille, columns 4-

5, are inapplicable here, where a liquid nozzle is disposed to one side of the air-powder nozzle as now claimed.

Wiek et al. was cited as disclosing the claimed arrangement of nozzles (e.g., nozzles 11a, 11c in Fig. 2), but Wiek does not disclose or suggest an arrangement capable of forming an eddy or vortex, much less an eddy or vortex in the treated sub-gingival gum pocket as now claimed.

For at least these reasons, allowance of claims 1-3, 10-13, 17-21 and 23-28 is now requested. Further, in view of such allowance, rejoinder and allowance of withdrawn claims 4-9 and 14-16 is requested as well.

Unclear language in claims 1 and 26 is being corrected.

There is an objection to claim 12. The claim is believed to be clear. Please note that claim 12 recites: “in each of the radial planes of the tube...at least three nozzle openings...are disposed....” Reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Finder
Registration No.: 30,173
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

JAF:lf